

Remarks

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. Claims 1-6 have been allowed. Claims 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, and 18 are indicated as having allowable subject matter. Claims 1, 7, 9, 13, and 15 have been amended. Claims 8 and 14 have been cancelled. The drawings have been corrected. The specification has been amended. Reconsideration and re-examination of the application is respectfully requested for the reasons set forth herein.

1. The Examiner has objected to the drawings, because insulating members shown in the drawings are not properly cross-hatched. Replacement drawing sheets showing Figures 8D, 9, and 18 have been submitted showing the insulating members properly cross-hatched. Removal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.
2. The Examiner has objected to claim 1, because of a grammatical error. Claim 1 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Removal of the objection to claim 1 is respectfully requested.
3. The Examiner has rejected claims 7, 10, and 11 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,638,104 issued to Hashimoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,551,116 issued to Liu. Claim 7 has been amended to include all of the claim limitations of defendant claim 8, which has been indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 8 has been cancelled. Because all of the claim limitations of claim 8 and its intervening claims have been

added to claim 7, the combination of Hashimoto in view of Liu does not teach all of the claim limitations of claim 7. Removal of the rejection of claim 7 for obviousness-type double patenting is respectfully requested.

Because claim 9 now depends from a cancelled claim, claim 9 has been amended to depend from amended claim 7. Claims 10 and 11 depend from independent claim 7. As previously discussed, the combination of Hashimoto in view of Liu does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 7. The combination of Hashimoto in view of Liu therefore does not teach all the claim limitations of claims 10 and 11. Removal of the rejection of claims 10 and 11 for obviousness-type double patenting is respectfully requested.

4. The Examiner has rejected claims 13, 16, 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,551,116 issued to Liu.

Claim 13 has been amended to include all of the claim limitations of defendant claim 14, which has been indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if re-written in independent form to include all the limitations of its base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 14 has been cancelled. Because all of the claim limitations of claim 14 and its intervening claims have been added to claim 13, Liu does not teach all of the claim limitations of claim 13. Removal of the rejection of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Because claim 15 now depends from a cancelled claim, claim 15 has been amended to depend from amended claim 13. Claims 16, 17, and 19 depend from independent claim 13. As previously discussed, Liu does not teach all the claim limitations of claim 13. Liu therefore does not teach all the claim limitations of claims 16, 17, and 19. Removal of the rejection of claims 16, 17, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

5. The specification has been amended to correct a typographical and a grammatical error.

Approval of the amendments to the specification is respectfully requested.

In view of the amendments and arguments presented herein, the application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and passage to issue is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Order Account No. 501581.

Respectfully submitted,
Sasame et al., Applicants



Jennifer Mae Slonaker
Registration No. 50568
Attorney for Applicants
Phone: 717.399.1535
Facsimile: 717.291.4660